

arbiter 71. The arbiter 71 can resolve contentions on the bus using one of two management methods. In a first method, an algorithm arranges to have copy/scan and other walk up operations to have the highest priority, Net Print jobs can have the next highest priority, and the fax direct print job has the lowest priority.

Beginning at column 15 line 56, *Salgado* discusses six templates for managing the control of jobs. In each of these templates, one type of job is favored over another type of job meaning the favored job has a higher priority over the less-favored job. As discussed above, when a higher priority job interrupts a lower priority job, the lower priority job is halted until the higher priority job is completed. Accordingly, one of ordinary skill would understand that *Salgado* does not disclose that two different jobs, such as copy/scan job and Net Print job, can operate in parallel. In other words, this reference fails to disclose or suggest controlling execution of an external job and a scanning job such that the controller makes said one or plurality of compressing/expanding devices execute processing of the external job and that of the scanning job **in parallel** when it is discriminated that the activation instructions of the scanning job is made by said operation device, as recited in claim 1.

Mishima is applied for its alleged discussion of using plural compression/elongation processing devices. However, upon close inspection one of ordinary skill would find that *Mishima* also does not disclose the processing of two different jobs in parallel. But rather discloses that the data related to one job can be processed through any number of the plural compression/elongation devices.

With respect to allocation of the compression/elongation (expansion) processors, *Mishima* discloses the following:

As mentioned above, the central processing unit (CPU) 503 sets the four compression/expansion processors 506-509 for compression or expansion. The CPU 503 sets internal registers in the data transfer processors 501, 504 and 510 and in the compression/expansion processors 506-509 according to a relationship between an amount of data inputted to the memory unit 13 and that outputted from the memory unit 13 determined according to the content of a copy job. In the setting, the number of the compression/expansion processors 506-509 for compression and that of expansion are changed appropriately for the most efficient data transfer.

In concrete, when image data are only stored in the memory unit 13, all the compression/expansion processors 506-509 are set for compression. When image data are stored in and read from the memory unit 13 at the same time, two of the compression/expansion processors 506-509 are set for compression, while the remaining two are set for expansion. This setting assumes that an amount of data inputted to the memory unit 13 is equal to that outputted from the memory unit 13. However, an amount of data inputted to the memory unit 13 is larger than that outputted from the memory unit 13, for example, when the code data written to the code memory 511 is read while thinning them or when a copy job to output the code data of only even pages is set. In such cases, for example, three of the compression/expansion processors 506-509 are set for compression, while the remaining one is set for expansion. When image data are only read, all the compression/expansion processors 506-509 are set for expansion. (equivalent U.S. patent No. 6,381,031, col. 5, lines 25-54).

Based on the foregoing, it should be readily apparent that the number of compression/expansion processors is changed to achieve the most efficient data transfer. There is neither an explicit disclosure nor suggestion in *Mishima* that the data of two separate jobs can be processed in parallel at the same time.

In the "Response to Argument" section of the Office Action, the Office sets forth reasons it believes that *Salgado* and *Mishima* are combinable to achieve Applicants' claimed results. The Office fails to assert, however, that the combination of these references can produce a device that can process an external job and a scanning job of the operation device in parallel. As noted above, neither *Salgado* nor *Mishima* discloses a technique, concept, or circumstance in which two separate jobs are processed in parallel as recited in claim 1. Given the guidance provided in each reference and if hypothetically combined as alleged by the Office, it appears

that at best the resulting device assigns a priority to various print jobs and when a higher priority job interrupts a lower priority job, the lower priority job is halted until the higher priority job is completed. Also the resulting device would use an appropriate number of compression/expansion devices that provides the most efficient data transfer.

In summary, *Salgado* and *Mishima* when applied individually or collectively fail to disclose or suggest every feature and/or the combination of features recited in Applicants' claims. As a result, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established. Thus, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION


Based on the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 14 and 16 are allowable and this application is in condition for allowance. In the event any unresolved issues remain the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' representative identified below.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: January 30, 2009

By:


Shawn B. Cage
Registration No. 51522

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404
703 836 6620